Compliments of the author.

Copr. 1938jdbell,trademarkreguspatoff.

UNVEILING THE UNIVERSE

WHAT IS TRUTH?

By GLEN H. DRAPER
Mathematician, Arlington, Va.

Copr 1938 by GLEN H. DRAPER

I have a theory of the universe, but until we agree upon "What is Truth?" there is no need in going into theories which are not traditional.

Many philosophers, of recent and earlier times, have constructed their systems disregarding the answer to Pilate's query found in Proverbs 4:7—"Wisdom is the principal thing; therefore get wisdom: and with all thy getting, get understanding." *Understanding* should be the basis of knowing, and mathematicians notwithstanding, there is no purely abstract knowledge, but all must ultimately rest upon experience.

The criterion for knowing truth, which must be accepted before a general theory of the universe can be acceptable, demands that the word structure rest upon the understanding of its parts in relation to the whole system—so much so that we must almost seem to have completed the entire structure before being able to lay the foundation, especially as we must use a language which is ambiguous to say the least. In other words, our philosophy should cease to use words as if they had meaning in and of themselves—pure abstractions. Words have meaning only by their relations to concetps, or other words which have meaning in concepts. I use the term "concept" to mean a definite idea as opposed to a notion or a vague idea. That is, a concept is conceivable and has been conceived or formed in the mind, notwithstanding the eminent Doctor who said "A yard stick with only one end is a perfectly good concept".

If you deny me the right to make definite the meaning of the terms that have developed into ambiguous symbols, then to read further is of no avail. I ask only that you criticise this thesis on possible inconsistencies or possible paradoxes that you may expect to remain after my limiting the meaning of words to pointers toward definite concepts.

The almost medieval dogmatism of these present times, and the tendency of unscientific minds to accept in mystified awe the authority of their leaders who are sometimes very apt at slogans and catch-word names, go along with the demand for abstraction and the neglect of understanding by many of our leaders themselves.

In 1905, the Naval Observatory received and graciously "placed on file" the theory of Einstein. This same theory after being publicized under the catch name "relativity" by Eddington is now hailed as "the supreme court of science;" yet as to understanding and wisdom, the followers of Einstein know his theory only as a method of manipulating symbols, and not as a chain of mutually related concepts each clearly understood in relation to observation or experience. In fact, it is commonly stated that "it is absurd for anyone to ask for physical definitions of the terms used". The major premise of Einstein's theory states that it is impossible within a system to determine any motion of the system. The Foucault pendulum does exist and does

Digitized by the Center for Adventist Research

determine such a motion even after Einstein said, "No amount of experimentation can prove me right, but a single observation at any time may prove me wrong". Mathematicians get out of such difficulty by asserting "Mathematical terms are purely abstract, having no relation to things of physics".

Truth can never be asserted in abstract and meaningless terms, or by definitions which are irrevocable outside of any understanderable concept, and fortunately mathematical terms do not obey the mathematicians and they do have their definitions founded in relations of experience.

A word is a symbol which must point towards some definite aspect of the universe if it is to have meaning; and the meaning of any word is determined by the position it fills in a relationship.

Socrates in trying to understand a word, to ascertain the precise meaning which he himself gave it, in using it, found that he gained more insight into his own ignorance, and at the same time that he acquired more real knowledge than by all other studies combined. That is the distinguishing characteristic of a philosopher. Aristotle repeatedly urged "Let us first understand the facts and then we may speak for their causes", but apparently did not hear himself. He made theories contrary to even elementary observations. Also Bacon, Descartes, Locke, and many other philosophers at times, disregarded meaning and believed in the fundamentally independent existence of the entities of the universe, yet they were able to do much toward finding truth, because they sought for meaning. But what of the modern mathematicians that follow the philosophy exemplified in Ptolemy, and stated in modern times in the following definition of mathematics:—"Mathematics is that subject in which we never know what we are talking about, nor whether what we are saying is true". They assert that mathematics is man-made yet they fail to realize that there is not a single instance that they can point to as an example of mathematics doing the will of the mathematician, before the mathematician first finds out what he *must* will for it to do.

Man is supreme in the art of his symbols and in the pronunciations that they may be known by, but he has no power whatever of creation. Once he has designated a pointer to a referent, he must observe to discover it meaning. Even Adam had to observe before the names he applied had significance. Nature is what it is and the most that men can do is to observe and master it by recognizing the interrelationships. "Unto every kingdom, material or spiritual, is given a law; and unto every law there are certain bounds and conditions".

The following quotation, to be found in many modern books of philosophy is illustrative of the open-mindedness of would be thinkers today. "To define truth is difficult and is really unnecessary, for in its more general sense, it is perfectly well understood. As our knowledge grows we have to revise our ideas. The truth of yesterday may be falsehood today. Ptolemaic astronomy, Aristotelian logic, scholastic metaphysics, were all expedient for centuries, but now we know these things to be only relatively true; in the "absolute" they are false. The truth of an idea is not a stagnant property inherent in it. Truth happens to an idea. It becomes true, it is made true by events".

Upon analysis the only meaning that I can obtain from that quotation is:—by "events" we are to understand publicity by catch-word names

Digitized by the Center for Adventist Research

and phrases and then by "truth" we are to understand only that which we usually refer to by the terms "fashion" or "belief". Can you find any other possible meaning in the quotation?

Truly, words receive their meanings from their relationship to other words used with them. There is no privileged origin in the infinite universe, and likewise, no privileged first word or term in the infinite possibilities of knowledge. Meaning comes as a unit concept, a definite idea, which necessarily has an infinity of interrelationships. Notwithstanding this, many philosophers maintain the mystical idea that words have meaning in and of themselves, and therefore their definitions exist independent of anything else, and that certain of them are fundamental, to be had without definition, perhaps by intuition, and to be used to define other terms. Nothing could be further from the truth. In order to define a word, it is necessary and sufficient to show by its use its need in forming a concept; nothing conceived, nothing defined, whereas, full conception gives perfect definition, Hence, to give a perfect definition of a term it must be assumed that all other terms are understood. That is to say, the use of a word in a sentence which conveys a concept defines the word by the position filled in the concept by the use of that word, and if two or more unknown terms are used in a sentence, then at most the definition of each is ambiguous. No definition of a term is stronger than the weakest part of the concept from which its definition is obtained. That explains why it is difficult to learn a new subject, or to accept a new theory. The general concept must be built one unknown at a time, and all must be founded upon some experience or observation. Concepts do not exist in the purely abstract.

Statements may be divided into three classes:—true, false, and ambiguous.

In the class "true" are those statements which contain no vague or undefined term, and in which each term is explicitly defined by description, so as to agree with the implied meaning of the entire statement. For illustration:—the sum of the squares on the two legs of a plane right angled triangle is equal to the square on the hypotenuse. Definitely true! because the dictionary defines each of the terms in agreement with the way it is used, and these individual definitions are sufficient to form a definite concept from the statement.

The second class are those statements which contain at least one term which denies possibility to a concept. These statements are false. For example:—the statement that the Newtonian inverse-square-law is the law of gravitation is definitely false. Newton himself recognized this and asserted that the statement was absurd because the phrase "inverse-square-law" implies" instantaneous-action-at-a-distance" the contradictory to the term "force" the necessary implication of the term "gravitation". The statement is an idea, but cannot be a concept, because it is self-contradictory, and hence cannot be conceived. Newton did not ask, "Does it work?" He asked himself, "Is it true?" His inverse square law worked to such a nicety that scientists of the nineteenth century came to define truth on its working power, but to Newton there was no sense in saying an absurdity is true.

If a statement is true, it will work even though no observation has ever been made, but a statement may be in agreement with observations yet not true; as an example of this we have Galileo's statement of

Digitized by the Center for Adventist Research

falling bodies. Galileo could not give a conceptional cause of a body falling and therefore his statement was neither true nor false. Newton's law and now Einstein's does give us a conceptional cause and we find that a body falls only in the presence of a second body, which mutually falls according to the sum of the masses; Aristotle's statement. Galileo's statement works to the limit of our observing ability but in obtaining the conceptional definition of "falling" we find his statement definitely false.

The third class of statements contains at least one term which remains ambiguous until more data are obtained. These statements are indefinite ideas, neither true nor false. These statements serve well the purposes of sophists, yet every advance ever made in science, in philosophy, or in knowledge generally is made as a result of someone observing and recognizing significance in some term which elevates a statement from this merely rhetorical class into that of being true.

This third class of statements can be subdivided immediately into two subclasses:—

(a) Statements which explicitly or implicitly, contain the personal element "I" which always permits free-will deception.

(b) Statements which use words that point to no definite concept and hence have no concept content, or words that are assumed to be abstract and wholly independent of at least one other word or symbol. A statement may be intrinsically true, yet in this ambiguous class because of the things man says about it. For example, verified mathematical equations are impersonal and consistent within themselves, but man in his egoism makes them mysterious by the things he says concerning them. For example, wherever the term zero is used the mathematician will not accept the definition the relationships themselves give, but he asserts that zero is abstract and absolute.

Since words and symbols must be employed to make a statement, the statement may be definite and therefore true for the man who first made the statement, but when it is repeated by another, there is a high probability that the statement is vague and indefinite, neither true nor false, merely rhetorical. For instance:—one of Euclid's axioms reads: "Things equal to the same thing are equal to each other." This is true only for those who are able to use other concept terms to say the same things, for all others it is merely a sophism. A much better way to state this axiom is: "Things which satisfy the same definition are equal;" that is to say things are made to be idectical by the mental process of concept classification. In nature no two things are identical, and hence the concept is not the external substance, if any, but is the limited, relevant relationship in the mind. Knowledge is obtainable only in a conscious mind. Knowledge without relations is nonsense. All concepts must be supported by observations, but observations are not to be confused with concepts. Observations are meaningless unless interpreted by concepts. The essence of matter apart from time is nonsense by the very nature of knowledge. Even the "infallible" relativists disregard this classification of statements, and hence they do not understand what their mathematics tell them. To understand, one must accept what he must accept, and assert his ego only when his ego agrees with concepts.

A word cannot be said to be defined if another word, usable with it, is said to be abstract and absolutely independent of it. This condition

Digitized by the Center for Adventist Research

has never been met because in the past it has been practically impossible for man to conceive a relationship between time and matter demanding the one wherever and whenever the other exists. This relationship is derived from the mathematics of Einstein interpreted into concepts and is the center of my theory of the universe. Truth is a concept and a concept is truth.

Now for a test of this philosophy. Can you arrange words together in a manner to form a definite concept, which concept agrees with the explicit statements you can make of each of the terms used, which statements are definite, and yet the arrangement is not to be called true in your own mind? Or can you give a truth in which there is used a single term which you do not understand?

I challenge you to try it!

Digitized by the Center for Adventist Research

After these percentages have been determined, create a Special Fund for each kind of Disbursement for each Industry.

Appoint Trust Companies to administer the Funds; One, or more, for each City, or Section, or Separate Trust Company for each Industry, or for each Fund. Whichever is most economical and efficient.

Have Department of Commerce appear as Arbitrators for Employes in all Collective Bargaining between Employers and Employees.

Then determine the "net worth" to the Industry of each "position" and or "job" and or "person". Fix a "YEARLY" renumeration rate for each "position" or "job".

Allot a certain percentage of all WAGES; ACCIDENTS; SALARIES; DIVIDENDS; and other such expenses connected with the Human Factor, as an Insurance Fund to be used for OLD AGE DEPENDENCY